arXiv:1611.01442v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 4 Nov 2016

Pomeranchuk instability and response beyond the quasiparticle regime

Egor I. Kiselev,[1] Mathias S. Scheurer,[1] Peter Wölfle,[1,2] and Jörg Schmalian[1,3]

[1] *Institut für Theorie der Kondensierten Materie, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[2] *Institut für Nanotechnologie, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76344 Karlsruhe, Germany*
[3] *Institut für Festkörperphysik, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76344 Karlsruhe, Germany*

An ordered state in the spin sector that breaks parity without breaking time-reversal symmetry, i.e., that can be considered as dynamically generated spin-orbit coupling, was proposed to explain puzzling observations in a range of different systems. Here we derive severe restrictions for such a state that follow from a Ward identity related to spin conservation. It is shown that $l = 1$ spin-Pomeranchuk instabilities are not possible in non-relativistic systems since the response of spin-current fluctuations is entirely incoherent and non-singular. This rules out relativistic spin-orbit coupling as an emergent low-energy phenomenon. We illustrate the exotic physical properties of the remaining higher angular momentum analogues of spin-orbit coupling and derive a geometric constraint for spin-orbit vectors in lattice systems.

Fermi liquid (FL) theory [1–4] forms the intellectual foundation of our understanding of quantum fluids such as ^{3}He, fermionic atomic gases, as well as simple metals and numerous strongly-correlated systems. The inherent instability of the FL state was analyzed early-on by Pomeranchuk [5], who derived the threshold values $-(2l+1)$ for the phenomenological Landau parameters $F_l^{s,a}$ beyond which newly ordered states are expected to emerge. Here, l corresponds to the angular momentum channel under consideration and s (a) refers to order in the charge (spin) sector. These criteria were derived from an analysis of the quasiparticle contribution to the energy of a FL. Famous examples of Pomeranchuk instabilities are phase separation for $F_0^s \to -1$, ferromagnetism for $F_0^a \to -1$, or charge- and spin nematic order for $F_2^{s,a} \to -5$. Our main interest here will be the behavior for $F_1^a \to -3$, which was proposed by Wu and Zhang [6] and which would lead to a state with order in the spin sector that breaks parity while time-reversal symmetry remains intact. Such order has been invoked to explain the behavior in systems as diverse as chromium [7, 8], $Sr_3Ru_2O_7$ [9], the hidden order in URu_2Si_2 [10], or the physics in the vicinity of a ferromagnetic quantum phase transition [11]. The associated dynamic generation of spin-orbit coupling of Ref. 6 was analyzed in great detail in Ref. 12. Even ^{3}He was argued to be in the vicinity of a corresponding instability [6].

In this letter, we demonstrate that $l = 1$ Pomeranchuk instabilities in the spin channel are not possible, an effect that is caused by a breakdown of the quasiparticle description of the FL. Specifically, the divergence in the quasiparticle susceptibility is exactly canceled by a vanishing vertex that connects the response of quasiparticles and bare fermions. As a consequence, the response of the system is entirely incoherent and the analysis of the energy balance of Ref. 5 turns out to be incomplete. The origin of this peculiar behavior is that the spin-current, which is closely related to the instability, is itself not a conserved quantity, yet it is the current of a conserved density. This allows to draw rigorous conclusions from associated Ward identities that exclude second order phase transitions. At the level of the Hartree-Fock approximation, this has been found earlier in Ref. 13. Our arguments imply that the absence of a second-oder instability for $l = 1$ is, in fact, exact. Following an argument by Bloch (see Refs. 14, 15), we also show that a first order transition is not allowed either. While some of those conclusions could have been drawn from the vast literature on the FL theory and its microscopic foundations (see in particular the work by Leggett in Ref. 16), the ongoing discussion of this instability in Refs. 6–12 seems to warrant a detailed analysis of this issue. In addition, it is shown that relativistic spin-orbit coupling cannot emerge due to spontaneous symmetry breaking of the electron liquid at low energies. Spontaneously generated spin-orbit interactions are only expected in higher angular momentum channels with unconventional residual symmetry groups exhibiting exotic physical behavior such as enhanced anomalous Hall conductivities. Finally, the implications of our findings for lattice systems are discussed.

The phenomenological formulation of FL theory is based on the celebrated parametrization of the energy change due to quasiparticle excitations [1, 2] $\delta E_{\rm qp} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\sigma} \varepsilon^*_{\boldsymbol{k}\sigma} \delta n_{\boldsymbol{k}\sigma}$, with single-particle energy

$$\varepsilon^*_{\boldsymbol{k}\sigma} = v_F(|\boldsymbol{k}| - k_F) + \mu + \frac{1}{\rho_F} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}',\sigma'} F^{\sigma,\sigma'}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}'} \delta n_{\boldsymbol{k}'\sigma'}, \qquad (1)$$

where μ, k_F, $v_F = \frac{m}{m^*} v_F^0$, $\rho_F = \frac{m^*}{m}\rho_F^0$, and m^*/m denote, respectively, the Fermi energy, momentum, velocity, the density of states, and the mass renormalization. For the interaction function we use the usual expansion for isotropic Fermi surfaces in the absence of spin-orbit coupling, $F^{\sigma,\sigma'}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}'} = F^s_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}'} + \sigma\sigma' F^a_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}'}$, $F^r(\theta) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} F_l^r P_l(\cos\theta)$, with Legendre polynomials P_l and $\cos\theta = \boldsymbol{e_k} \cdot \boldsymbol{e_{k'}}$. Here $r = s$ and $r = a$ for the symmetric (charge) and anti-symmetric (spin) channel, respec-



Figure 1: Distortion of the spin-up (green) and spin-down (blue) Fermi surface for the $l = 1$ Pomeranchuk instability in the (a) charge and (b) spin channel.

tively. Pomeranchuk concluded that an instability with a spontaneous deformation of the Fermi surface (see, e.g., Fig. 1)

$$k_F \to k_F + \delta k^s_{F,l}(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}_F}) + \sigma \delta k^a_{F,l}(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}_F}) \tag{2}$$

occurs, when $F_l^{s,a} \to -(2l+1)$. Here $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}_F}$ is the angle of the Fermi wave vector relative to some arbitrarily chosen axis. Specifically, the energy change due to quasiparticle excitations was found to be [5]

$$\delta E_{\rm qp} = \frac{1}{\rho_F^0}\frac{m}{m^*}\sum_{l,r=\{s,a\}} |\delta n_l^r|^2 \left(1 + \frac{F_l^r}{2l+1}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left((\delta n_l^r)^4\right). \tag{3}$$

Here, δn_l^r is the change in the quasiparticle occupation in momentum space caused by $\delta k^r_{F,l}(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}_F})$ and acts as order parameter of the new phase. If m/m^* remains finite and the coefficient of $|\delta n_l^r|^2$ becomes negative, an instability to a state with $\delta n_l^r \neq 0$ is energetically favored. This happens once F_l^r reaches the above threshold value. The response of quasiparticles can also be characterized by the quasiparticle susceptibility

$$\chi^r_{{\rm qp},l} = \frac{\rho_F}{1 + \frac{F_l^r}{2l+1}}. \tag{4}$$

For $l = 0$ this corresponds to the well known expressions of the charge and spin susceptibilities for the symmetric (s) and antisymmetric (a) channel, respectively. $\chi^r_{{\rm qp},l}$ diverges as $F_l^r \to -(2l+1)$, which coincides with the Pomeranchuk instability criterion.

Below we demonstrate that the leading order expansion of the full energy with respect to δn_1^r is rigorously given by

$$\delta E^r_{l=1} = \frac{1}{\rho_F^0}|\delta n_1^r|^2 + \mathcal{O}\left((\delta n_1^r)^4\right), \tag{5}$$

ruling out the corresponding Pomeranchuk instability and demonstrating that the analysis of the energy (3) of quasiparticles is not sufficient. This is closely related to the fact that the susceptibility of the system is not adequately expressed in terms of its quasiparticle contribution in Eq. (4).

In the microscopic foundation of FL theory [17], one divides the single-particle Green's function $G_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\omega)$ in a coherent quasiparticle contribution and an incoherent background,

$$G_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\omega) = \frac{Z}{\omega + i0^+ - \varepsilon^*_{\boldsymbol{k}}} + G^{\rm inc.}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\omega). \tag{6}$$

Z is the spectral weight and $\varepsilon^*_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ the single-particle energy in Eq. (1). A detailed analysis of the susceptibilities of a many-body system was given by Leggett [16], who finds

$$\chi_l^r = (\gamma_l^r Z)^2 \chi^r_{{\rm qp},l} + \chi^r_{{\rm inc},l}. \tag{7}$$

Here, $\chi^r_{{\rm qp},l}$ is the quasiparticle response of Eq. (4) and γ_l^r the vertex that connects the response of quasiparticles and bare fermions. Finally, $\chi^r_{{\rm inc},l}$ is the incoherent response of the system, a contribution that is directly related to the incoherent part $G^{\rm inc.}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\omega)$ of the single-particle Green's function (6). The incoherent response of the system can now be expressed as

$$\chi^r_{{\rm inc},l} = \chi_l^{r(\omega)} \equiv \lim_{\omega\to 0}\lim_{\boldsymbol{q}\to\boldsymbol{0}} \chi_l^r(\boldsymbol{q},\omega), \tag{8}$$

taking into account that $\chi^r_{{\rm qp},l}$ vanishes in this limit.

Next we discuss implications for susceptibilities that are caused by conservation laws, i.e., associated with a Hermitian operator Φ that commutes with the Hamiltonian H of the system, $[\Phi, H] = 0$. An example is charge or particle-number conservation ($\Phi = N$). In a non-relativistic system with Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H = &\int_{\boldsymbol{r}\alpha} \psi^\dagger_\alpha(\boldsymbol{r})\left(-\frac{\hbar^2\nabla^2}{2m} - \mu + U(\boldsymbol{r})\right)\psi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{r}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int_{\boldsymbol{r}\alpha,\boldsymbol{r}'\beta} \psi^\dagger_\alpha(\boldsymbol{r})\psi^\dagger_\beta(\boldsymbol{r}')V(\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}')\psi_\beta(\boldsymbol{r}')\psi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{r}), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

the conservation of the components of the total spin $\Phi = S^j$ is another example. Here we use ψ_α ($\psi^\dagger_\alpha$) to represent the annihilation (creation) of a bare fermion of spin α and apply the convention $\int_{\boldsymbol{r}\alpha} \ldots = \int {\rm d}^d r \sum_\alpha \ldots$. Let us first focus on the case without crystal potential $U(\boldsymbol{r})$, which yields the bare dispersion $\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m} - \mu$, and comment on the implications of a finite crystal potential at the end.

We write $\Phi = \int {\rm d}^d r \rho^\phi(\boldsymbol{r})$ with density $\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}} = \frac{1}{V}\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\alpha\beta} \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}+\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\alpha}\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\psi_{\boldsymbol{k}-\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\beta}$ in momentum space and form factor $\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}$. The charge density corresponds to $\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$, and a spin density amounts to $\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \sigma^j_{\alpha\beta}$, $j = 1,2,3$, with Pauli matrices σ^j. Let us assume that $\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}$ commutes with the interacting (non-quadratic) part $H_{\rm int}$ of the Hamiltonian,

$$\left[\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}, H_{\rm int}\right] = 0. \tag{10}$$

This is the case, e.g., for interactions of the form $H_{\rm int} = f[\{\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}\}]$ such as $H_{\rm int} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{q}} U_{\boldsymbol{q}}\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}\rho^\phi_{-\boldsymbol{q}}$. Most importantly,

this also holds for both the spin and charge density in the case of the non-relativistic solid-state Hamiltonian (9) with electron-electron Coulomb interaction. If Eq. (10) applies, we can derive a Ward identity (see Supplementary Information) that implies

$$\chi_\rho\left(\boldsymbol{q}=\boldsymbol{0},\omega\neq 0\right)=0 \tag{11}$$

for the susceptibility χ_ρ of the conserved density $\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}$ and

$$\chi_J^{(q)ij}\equiv\chi_J^{ij}\left(\boldsymbol{q}\to 0,0\right)=-\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\gamma\delta}\left(\phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\right)^2\frac{\partial n_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{\partial k_i}\frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{\partial k_j}, \tag{12}$$

for the susceptibility χ_J of the current $\boldsymbol{J}_\phi$ associated with $\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}$. In Eq. (12), $n_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ denotes the momentum occupation and the limit $\boldsymbol{q}\to 0$ has to be performed along the ith direction after the limit $\omega\to 0$, which is indicated by the superscript (q).

The implication of Eq. (11) for susceptibilities of conserved quantities is obvious and well established. Let the form factor be $\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}=\sigma^j_{\alpha\beta}$, $j=0,3$. Then follows from Eq. (11) that $\chi^{s,a}_{\mathrm{inc},0}=\chi_0^{s,a(\omega)}=0$, i.e., the entire response of the system is coherent. The same Ward identity can also be used to show that $\gamma_0^{s,a}=Z^{-1}$ and leads to the well known relation $\chi^r_0=\chi^r_{\mathrm{qp},0}$ with quasiparticle susceptibility given in Eq. (4). This means that the susceptibility of a conserved density is fully determined by the quasiparticle response. Using the formalism of Ref. 16, one can also determine the next order corrections in q/ω,

$$\chi^r_0(\boldsymbol{q},\omega)=\frac{q^2}{\omega^2}\frac{m}{m^*}\left(1+\frac{F^r_1}{3}\right)+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{q}{\omega}\right)^4\right). \tag{13}$$

Let us next exploit the Ward identity (12) for the current. If the Fermi energy is the largest energy scale, we can replace $\frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{\partial k_i}$ by $\frac{k_F}{m}\cos\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ in the current operator $\boldsymbol{J}_\phi$ showing that the charge ($\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}=\sigma^0$) and spin ($\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}=\sigma^3$) current susceptibilities correspond to $l=1$ instabilities with $r=s$ and $r=a$, respectively. Analyzing Eq. (12) yields our key result $\chi_1^{s,a}=\rho^0_F$, which, via Legendre transformation, leads to Eq. (5). A Pomeranchuk instability in the $l=1$ channel is therefore not possible.

If one further uses the continuity equation $\frac{\omega^2}{q^2}\chi_\rho(\boldsymbol{q},\omega)=\chi_J(\boldsymbol{q},\omega)-\chi_J(\boldsymbol{q},0)$ one can identify the vertex and incoherent contribution for the spin-current susceptibility [16]

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^r_1&=Z^{-1}\frac{m}{m^*}\left(1+\frac{1}{3}F^r_1\right),\\ \chi^r_{\mathrm{inc},1}&=\rho^0_F\left[1-\frac{m}{m^*}\left(1+\frac{1}{3}F^r_1\right)\right],\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where we used Eq. (13). Let us analyze Eq. (14) for the charge and spin response separately. For a Galilean-invariant system, the charge current is itself a conserved quantity and Eq. (11) implies that $\chi^s_{\mathrm{inc},1}=0$. Thus, we recover the celebrated result $\frac{m^*}{m}=1+\frac{1}{3}F^s_1$. In addition, it follows $\gamma^s_1=Z^{-1}$ and $\chi^s_1=\chi^s_{\mathrm{qp},1}=\rho^0_F$. While no Pomeranchuk instability will take place in the $l=1$ charge channel, these results are fully consistent with the analysis of Ref. 5 as the entire response in the $l=1$ charge channel of Galilean-invariant systems is coherent and captured by quasiparticle excitations.

The situation is different for currents that are, themselves, not conserved quantities, such as the spin current. If one approaches the Pomeranchuk threshold value, the vertex γ^a_1 vanishes and there is no contribution of the susceptibility due to quasiparticles. The divergence of the quasiparticle contribution of the susceptibility is suppressed by the vanishing vertex. As a consequence, the entire response becomes incoherent and the energetic analysis that led to Eq. (3) is not applicable, leading to Eq. (5) instead.

The arguments given so far exclude critical behavior in the $l=1$ channel with diverging susceptibility. To exclude a state with finite order parameter δn^r_1 that might be reached via a first order transition, we first note that δn^a_1 (δn^s_1) is proportional to the expectation value of $\boldsymbol{J}_\phi$ with $\phi=\sigma^3$ ($\phi=\sigma^0$). We can then apply the arguments of Refs. 14, 15 to show that, given any state with finite expectation value of $\boldsymbol{J}_\phi$, there is always a state with lower energy. Consequently, there is also no first order transition to an $l=1$ Pomeranchuk phase.

The results presented above yield strong restrictions on the interaction-induced generation of spin-orbit coupling associated with the order parameter

$$\Delta H=\int_{\boldsymbol{k},\alpha\beta}\psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}\alpha}\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{k})\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\alpha\beta}\psi_{\boldsymbol{k}\beta},\quad \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{k})=-\boldsymbol{g}(-\boldsymbol{k}). \tag{15}$$

Assume that the Hamiltonian (such as the non-relativistic Hamiltonian in Eq. (9) with $U=0$) has a symmetry group that is a direct product $\mathrm{SO}(d)_L\otimes\mathrm{SO}(3)_S$ in orbital and spin space with $d=3$ ($d=2$) for three-dimensional (two-dimensional) systems. We can then expand $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{k})$ in terms of basis functions (spherical harmonics $Y_{l,m}$ for $d=3$ and $e^{\pm il\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}}$ for $d=2$) transforming under the irreducible representations of $\mathrm{SO}(d)_L$. Noting that the basis functions of $l=1$ are superpositions of $\{k_j\}$, we conclude that the $l=1$ channel can be discarded. Since $l\otimes 1=(l+1)\oplus l\oplus(l-1)$, Eq. (15) cannot contain a term that is invariant under $\mathrm{SO}(d)_{L+S}$, the set of simultaneous spin and orbital rotations, which is the point group of a system with relativistic spin-orbit coupling. In this sense, relativistic spin-orbit coupling cannot occur as an emergent low-energy phenomenon.

However, spin-orbit coupling in higher angular momentum channels ($l\geq 3$) can be generated spontaneously and if this does occur, some rather exotic behavior follows as we discuss next. Focusing for simplicity on $d=2$, the remaining possible spin-orbit vectors are of the form

$$\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{k})=g_0\left(\cos(l\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}),\pm\sin(l\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}}),0\right)^T,\quad l=3,5,\ldots, \tag{16}$$



Figure 2: Part (b) and (d) show two examples of complex trajectories $z(t)$ that are allowed by Eq. (17) with corresponding spin-textures (for $\eta = +1$) given in (a) and (c), respectively. In the limit of a spherical Fermi surface, the texture of (a) coincides with the $l = 3$ Dresselhaus coupling in Eq. (16).

with residual symmetry group $\mathrm{SO}(2)_{L_3/l \pm S_3}$ generated by the combination $L_3/l \pm S_3$ of the out-of-plane components L_3 and S_3 of the orbital and spin angular momentum operators. For the upper (lower) sign, Eq. (16) can be seen as generalizations of the Rashba (Dresselhaus) spin-orbit term with $\boldsymbol{g}$ winding $w = l$ ($w = -l$) times on the Fermi surface. The generalized Dresselhaus term with $l = 3$ is illustrated in Fig. 2(a).

The unconventional form (16) of the spin-orbit coupling has interesting physical consequences: The Berry curvature (finite in the presence of a Zeeman term $\sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}} h\sigma_3 \psi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$) is enhanced by factor of l compared to the usual Rashba-Dresselhaus scenario which affects many electronic properties [18]. E.g., the anomalous Hall conductivity σ_{xy} [21], relating an applied electric field to a perpendicular electric current for $h \neq 0$, is enhanced by a factor of l, $\sigma_{xy} = l \cdot \sigma_{xy}|_{l=1}$. To illustrate another consequence of a spin-orbit vector of the form (16), let us assume that, in analogy to the proposal of Ref. 19, the system shows superconductivity in the s-wave channel. Describing the latter on the mean-field level by $\frac{\Delta}{2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}\uparrow} \psi^\dagger_{-\boldsymbol{k}\downarrow}$+H.c. and focusing on the relevant regime [19] where the chemical potential lies in the Zeeman-induced gap at $\boldsymbol{k} = 0$, we follow Ref. 20 and project the theory onto the lower, effectively spinless, band. We find that this low-energy model exhibits $(k_1 \mp i k_2)^l$-wave pairing. Recalling that $l \geq 3$, this not only corresponds to very exotic pairing but also leads to a topological class-D invariant $\nu = l$ and, thus, l chiral Majorana modes at the edge of the system.

Finally, let us discuss the modifications in the presence of a lattice, i.e., when the periodic potential $U(\boldsymbol{r})$ in Eq. (9) is finite. Since this additional term again commutes with the spin and charge density, we can still exclude all phases with order parameter of the form $O_{jj'} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}} \sigma^j k_{j'} \psi_{\boldsymbol{k}}$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $j' = 1, \ldots, d$. Note that this even holds when ions are taken into account as dynamical degrees of freedom since all interactions are functions of the electron and ion density alone. The main difference is that we cannot rule out any of the irreducible representations of the lattice point group G_p since k_j and $k_j f(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{k}})$ transform identically under G_p for any function f that is invariant under G_p. Nonetheless, our results still lead to significant restrictions. To see this, let us first introduce fermionic operators $c_{\boldsymbol{q}n}$, with band index n and crystal momentum $\boldsymbol{q}$, diagonalizing the non-interacting part H_0 of the Hamiltonian with resulting bandstructure $E_{n\boldsymbol{q}}$. Assuming that only one band $n = n_0$ is relevant, it holds $O_{jj'} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{q}} c^\dagger_{n_0\boldsymbol{q}} \sigma^j v_{j'}(\boldsymbol{q}) c_{n_0\boldsymbol{q}}$, where the summation is restricted to the first Brillouin zone and $v_j(\boldsymbol{q}) \equiv \partial_{q_j} E_{n_0\boldsymbol{q}}$. To proceed, we focus on $d = 2$ and treat the interaction-induced spin-orbit coupling on the mean-field level, i.e., add $\sum_{\boldsymbol{q}} c^\dagger_{n_0\boldsymbol{q}} \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{q}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} c_{n_0\boldsymbol{q}}$ with $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{q}) = (R_1(\boldsymbol{q}), \eta R_2(\boldsymbol{q}), 0)^T$ to the Hamiltonian where R_1 (R_2) transforms as x (y) under G_p and $\eta = \pm 1$. Evaluating the constraint $\langle O_{jj'} \rangle = 0$ in the regime where the Fermi energy is the largest relevant energy scale of the system, we obtain the equivalent condition

$$\int_0^{\varphi_{\mathrm{ir}}(G_p)} \mathrm{d}\varphi \, w(\varphi) |\boldsymbol{R}(\varphi)| \, e^{i\alpha(\varphi)} = 0, \tag{17}$$

where φ is the polar angle parameterizing the Fermi surface (restricted to the irreducible part of the Brillouin zone, $0 < \varphi < \varphi_{\mathrm{ir}}(G_p)$), $w(\varphi) = \boldsymbol{k}_F^2(\varphi)/|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}_F(\varphi) \boldsymbol{k}_F(\varphi)|$ is a Fermi surface weight function, depending on the Fermi momentum $\boldsymbol{k}_F$ and the Fermi-surface normal $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}_F$, and $\alpha(\varphi)$ denotes the angle between $\boldsymbol{R}(\varphi)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}_F(\varphi)$ [see Fig. 2(a)]. Upon defining $z(t) := \int_0^t \mathrm{d}\varphi \, w(\varphi) |\boldsymbol{R}(\varphi)| \, e^{i\alpha(\varphi)}$, we see that any spontaneously generated spin-orbit texture must lead to a closed trajectory $\{z(t) | 0 < t < \varphi_{\mathrm{ir}}(G_p)\}$. This restriction is illustrated in Fig. 2(b-d) for the point group $G_p = C_4$ where $\varphi_{\mathrm{ir}} = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and the boundary condition $\alpha(0) = \alpha(\varphi_{\mathrm{ir}}) \bmod 2\pi$ is dictated by rotational symmetry. Most importantly, we see in Fig. 2(c-d) that, as opposed to the continuum limit $G_p = \mathrm{SO}(2)_L$, spin-orbit vectors with net winding $w = \pm 1$ are possible albeit with much more complex structure than the conventional Rashba or Dresselhaus spin-orbit coupling as dictated by Eq. (17).

In summary, we have shown that neither a charge- nor a spin-Pomeranchuk instability with $l = 1$ can occur in a non-relativistic solid-state system. In particular, this implies that relativistic spin-orbit coupling with residual symmetry group $\mathrm{SO}(3)_{L+S}$ cannot be spontaneously generated. Furthermore, any realistic lattice

model involving spontaneously generated spin-orbit vectors $\boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{q}) = (R_1(\boldsymbol{q}), \pm R_2(\boldsymbol{q}), 0)^T$ must satisfy the severe constraint in Eq. (17) which is illustrated geometrically in Fig. 2.

We acknowledge fruitful discussions with B. Jeevanesan and S. Sachdev.

[1] L. Landau, Sov. Phys. JETP **3**, 920 (1957).
[2] L. Landau, Sov. Phys. JETP **5**, 101 (1957).
[3] G. Baym and C. Pethick, *Landau Fermi-Liquid Theory: Concepts and Applications* (Wiley-VCH, 1991), 1st ed., ISBN 9780471824183.
[4] D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, *The Superfluid Phases of Helium 3* (Taylor & Francis, 1990; Dover Publications, 2012).
[5] I. Pomeranchuk, Sov. Phys. JETP **8**, 361 (1958).
[6] C. Wu and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 036403 (2004).
[7] J. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 6820 (1990).
[8] J. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 6828 (1990).
[9] Y. Yoshioka and K. Miyake, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **81**, 023707 (2012).
[10] C. Varma and L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 036405 (2006).
[11] A. V. Chubukov and D. L. Maslov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 216401 (2009).
[12] C. Wu, K. Sun, E. Fradkin, and S.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 115103 (2007).
[13] J. Quintanilla and A. Schofield, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 115126 (2006).
[14] D. Bohm, Phys. Rev. **75**, 502 (1949).
[15] N. Bray-Ali and Z. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 012401 (2009).
[16] A. Leggett, Physical Review **140**, A1869 (1965).
[17] A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov, and I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, *Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics (Dover Books on Physics)* (Dover Publications, 1975), revised english ed., ISBN 9780486632285.
[18] D. Xiao, M.-C. Chang, and Q. Niu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1959 (2010).
[19] J. D. Sau, R. M. Lutchyn, S. Tewari, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 040502 (2010).
[20] J. Alicea, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 125318 (2010).
[21] We here focus on the intrinsic, i.e., disorder-independent, contribution to the anomalous Hall conductivity.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON "POMERANCHUK INSTABILITY AND RESPONSE BEYOND THE QUASIPARTICLE REGIME"

Egor I. Kiselev, Mathias S. Scheurer, Peter Wölfle, and Jörg Schmalian

In this supplementary material, we discuss how the Ward identity leading to Eqs. (11) and (12) of the main text is derived.

We first note that if Eq. (10) holds, the dynamics of the density will be governed by the noninteracting part H_0 of the Hamiltonian, $\partial_t \rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}} = i\left[H_0, \rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}\right]$, and leads to a continuity equation with current $\boldsymbol{J}_\phi = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\alpha\beta} \frac{\partial \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{\partial \boldsymbol{k}} \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}\alpha} \phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}} \psi_{\boldsymbol{k}\beta}$. In order to determine the associated susceptibilities χ_ρ and χ_J, we analyze the correlator

$$L^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q}}(\tau,\tau') = \left\langle T_\tau\, \psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}+\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\alpha}(\tau)\psi_{\boldsymbol{k}-\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\beta}(\tau)\psi^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{k}'-\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\gamma}(0)\psi_{\boldsymbol{k}'+\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\delta}(\tau')\right\rangle, \tag{S1}$$

where τ denotes imaginary time and T_τ the time-ordering operator. Following U. Behn, Phys. Status Solidi (b) **88**, 699 (1978), one obtains from the Heisenberg equation of motion of $\rho^\phi_{\boldsymbol{q}}$ the Ward identity for $L^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q}}(\tau,\tau')$. After Fourier transformation to frequencies, it reads

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\alpha\beta}\left(i\Omega - \left(\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}+\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}} - \varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}-\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}}\right)\right)\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}} L^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q}}(i\Omega, i\Omega') = \phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}'}\left(G_{\boldsymbol{k}'+\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\delta}(i\Omega') - G_{\boldsymbol{k}'-\frac{\boldsymbol{q}}{2}\gamma}(i\Omega'+i\Omega)\right), \tag{S2}$$

where $G_{\boldsymbol{k}}(i\Omega)$ is the exact single-particle Green's function on the imaginary axis. Its retarded analytic continuation has been introduced in Eq. (6).

The Ward identity (S2) allows to draw conclusions for the two susceptibilities

$$\chi_\rho(\boldsymbol{q}, i\Omega) = T\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\Omega'}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}'} L^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q}}(i\Omega, i\Omega'), \tag{S3a}$$

$$\chi^{ij}_J(\boldsymbol{q}, i\Omega) = T\sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\Omega'}\sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\phi^{\alpha\beta}_{\boldsymbol{k}}\frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}}}{\partial k_i}\phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}'}\frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}'}}{\partial k'_j} L^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{k}',\boldsymbol{q}}(i\Omega, i\Omega'). \tag{S3b}$$

Multiplying both sides of Eq. (S2) by $\phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}'}$ and $\phi^{\gamma\delta}_{\boldsymbol{k}'}\frac{\partial\varepsilon_{\boldsymbol{k}'}}{\partial k'_j}$, summation over $\boldsymbol{k}'$, Ω' as well as γ, δ readily leads (after analytic continuation $i\Omega \to \omega + i0^+$) to Eqs. (11) and (12), respectively.